3	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/038,844	SHAH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Justin I. King	2111
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>		
(1) Justin I. King (USPTO Personnel).	(3) <u>Lee Eubanks (App</u>	licant;'s Representative).
(2) Robert Manware (Applicant's Representative).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 November 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None		
Claims discussed: 12	·	
Prior art documents discussed: None		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT V	VAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. If of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. □ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	The examiner will provide a vine record of the substance of	the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representativ	e Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner confirms with Applicant's representatives that the new amendment is not necessarily limited to the one-to-one relationship as discussed in the previous interview. For instance, while the claim 12's amendment includes the one-to-one relationship between the transaction queue and a bridge link, it does not preclude the one-to-many relationship.